

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-4 stand rejected. Claims 5-11 are allowed. The rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully traversed below.

On page 3, Item 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-4 were indicated to be allowable if claim 1 were rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, which will be discussed in detail below. In view of the amendments to claim 1 to obviate the §112, second paragraph rejection, it is believed that all pending claims should now be in condition for allowance.

Objections to the Specification

The Specification was objected to for minor informalities. More specifically, the Office Action alleges that pages 4 and 15 of the specification contain “broken words.” Applicants have carefully reviewed the portions of the disclosure alleged to contain broken words. However, Applicants believe that the original copy of the specification submitted to the office contains no such errors. Accordingly, copies of pages 4 and 15 of the originally filed specification are provided to enable correction of the Office’s copy of the specification.

Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. More specifically, the Office Action asserts that the recitation “wherein said deflector is controlled... of said plurality of primary electron beams” in lines 10-13 of claim 1 renders the claim indefinite. The Examiner asserts that it is not understood how the deflector is controlled to deflect the secondary electron beams synchronously with scanning of the primary electron beams to prevent the secondary beams from moving on the detector in response to scanning of the primary electron beams.

Claim 1 has been amended to delete the language “wherein said deflector is controlled... of said plurality of primary electron beams” to obviate the §112, second paragraph rejection.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under §112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

Claims Amendments

Although claim 10 was not rejected or objected to, claim 10 has been amended hereby to clarify certain elements of the claim. It is believed that claim 10 continues to recite the features found allowable, as indicated on page 4 of the Office Action.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and accompanying remarks, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition allowance. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection and an indication of allowability of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are issues remaining to be resolved in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite and complete prosecution of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



William M. Schertler
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,348
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

WMS/dlt

Attachments – Pages 4 and 15 of the Original Specification